01-10-05

PTO/SB/21 (08-03) Approved for use through 08/30/03. OMB 0651-0031

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box -> +

Ider the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are re		Application Number	10/678,979	
TRANSMITTAL FORM			Filing Date	October 2, 2003
			First Named Inventor	Stephen D. Pacetti
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)  Total Number of Pages in This Submission (excluding references)		Group Art Unit	1734	
			Examiner Name	Laura Estelle Edwards
		3	Attorney Docket Number	50623.340
		ENCLO	OSURES (check all that apply)	
Deposit Account 07- Authorization			ment Papers Application)	After Allowance Communication to Group
⊠ Postage Paid Return Postcard		Drawing(s) In/Formal Sheets with Submission of Drawings Transmittal		Appeal Communication to Board Appeals and Interferences
Response ( pages)		Issue Fee Transmittal with PTO-85b (in duplicate)		Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
Amendment Transmittal Letter (in duplicate)		Request for Continued Examination Transmittal (RCE)		Proprietary Information
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Fee Transmittal Form (in duplicate)		Request for Status of Application
Petition for Extension of Time ( month) (in duplicate)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Information Disclosure Statement (in duplicate) with Form PTO-1449 and References		☐ Terminal Disclaimer ☐ Request for Refund		Statement Of The Substance Telephonic Interview on December 6, 2004
EV 337 975 851 US		CD, Number of CD(s)		
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Rema	rks	
Response to Missing Incomplete Applicati				
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53				
	SIGNAT	URE OF	APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, O	R AGENT
	Squire, Sanders & I Mark Lupkowski, F			
Signature Manh Lull			M	
Date January 6, 2005			· ·	
•		CEI	RTIFICATE OF MAILING	
hereby certify that this 52 US in an envelope 450 on this date: Janu	addressed to: BO	s being depo	osited with the United States Pos IENTS: Commissioner for Patent	stal Service as Express Mail # EV 337 ts, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 223
Typed or printed name	Patricia Gamb	le		
Signature Police		9.	1.0	Date January 6,, 2005



# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Examiner: Laura Estelle Edwards

Stephen D. Pacetti et al.

Serial No.:

10/678,979

Art Unit:

1734

Filed:

October 2, 2003

Title:

METHOD FOR SUPPORTING A STENT AND A METHOD OF

USING THE MADREL TO COAT A STENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW ON DECEMBER 6, 2004

#### Dear Examiner Edwards:

This is a Statement of the Substance of the telephonic interview which occurred on December 6, 2004 regarding the Office Action mailed on September 7, 2004.

### Claims discussed

All claims were discussed, in general. Claims 46 and 50 were discussed specifically.

### Prior art discussed

Moein (US 6,572,644), Edwin et al. (US 6,245,099), Taylor et al. (US 6,214,115), and Shannon et al. (US, 5,928,279)

## Summary of Discussion

The Examiner indicated the claims, in general, were anticipated by the prior art because they were given the most reasonably broad interpretation. In particular, the feature "gear" recited in all of the claims was given a broad interpretation.

Express Mail Label No. EV 337 974 851 US

With respect to claim 46, attorney for the applicant argued that, even with the broad interpretation of the claim, the feature of claim 46 "positioned on the mandrel to support the stent on an inner surface of the stent and to provide sufficient torque to the stent for rotating the stent during a coating process" was not taught by the cited prior art references. The Examiner indicated the feature could not be given patentable weight since there was no structure in the claim to support the feature. She suggested that the above-mentioned feature might be given patentable weight if the claim was amended to include such a structural limitation. The amendment to claim 46 includes such a structural limitation.

With respect to claim 50, attorney for the applicant argued that, even with the broad interpretation, the prior art cited does not teach the underlined portion of the feature "a gear supported by the mandrel having a diameter greater than a diameter of the mandrel and a diameter smaller than an inner diameter of the stent, the gear configured to provide support to the inner surface of the stent during a coating process. Attorney for the applicant indicated that the claim 50 was intended to cover at least the embodiment pictured in FIG. 4 of the application. Examiner suggested that an amendment that included a limitation describing spacing between an outer periphery of the gear and an inner surface of the stent may make the claim patentable. The amendment to claim 50 includes such a limitation.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (415) 954-0297.

Date: January 6, 2005

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey LLP One Maritime Plaza, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94111-3492 Telephone: 415.954.0297

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Lupkowski

Reg. No. 49,010 Attorney for Applicant